

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**
Richmond Division

ePLUS INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 3:09CV620 (REP)
)	
LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**DEFENDANT LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.’S MOTION TO EXPUNGE EPLUS’S
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND FOR
EXPEDITED BRIEFING AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

Defendant Lawson Software, Inc. (“Lawson”), by counsel, states as follows for its Motion to Expunge ePlus’s Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Motion for Contempt for Violation of Permanent Injunction and for Expedited Briefing on Lawsons’ Motion:

1. On January 24, 2013, the Court entered an Order [Dkt. No. 1002] setting forth a schedule for post-hearing briefing on ePlus’s Motion to Show Cause Why Lawson Should Not be Held in Contempt [Dkt. No. 798]. In that Order, the Court stated that if the Court determines that post-hearing briefs are needed, the colorably different issue and the infringement issue shall be briefed in separate briefs not to exceed twenty-five pages. *See* Order at 3-4. On April 9, 2013, at the hearing on ePlus’s Motion to Show Cause, the Court further instructed the parties to file a separate brief on the issue of remedies.

2. At approximately 8:00 p.m. on Friday, April 12, 2013, ePlus filed its opening briefs on the issues of colorable difference, infringement and remedies. In addition, ePlus filed

Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law [Dkt. No. 1060] (“Proposed Findings and Conclusions”). ePlus’s Proposed Findings and Conclusions is more than a hundred pages in length and goes far beyond the briefing permitted by the Court’s January 24 Order.

3. ePlus asserts that its Proposed Findings and Conclusions is filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, 35 U.S.C. § 283 and the Court’s Order of March 11, 2011 [Dkt. No. 629]. *See* Proposed Findings and Conclusions at 1. Rule 65 and 35 U.S.C. § 283, however, address injunctions, not contempt proceedings, and neither mentions the filing of proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Court’s Order of March 11, 2011 governed the injunctive relief application in which an evidentiary hearing was held on March 25, 2011 (*see* Dkt. No. 629 at ¶ 1) and oral argument was held on April 4, 2011 (*id.* at ¶ 5). The March 11, 2011 order was entered months before ePlus’s Motion to Show Cause was filed and has nothing to do with the pending ePlus application for an order of contempt.

4. ePlus’s Proposed Findings and Conclusions are nothing more than an attempt to evade the briefing limitations in the Court’s January 24 Order. Many of the purported findings of fact are not findings of fact at all, but are simply additional argument in support of ePlus’s contempt claims. Accordingly, the Court should not consider Plaintiff’s inappropriate submission, should order it expunged from the docket, and should require ePlus to re-file its briefs, striking the references to the Proposed Findings and Conclusions. The re-filed briefs should use only appropriate citations to the record and conform to the Court’s page limitations.

5. If the Court determines to modify its scheduling order for the contempt proceedings [Dkt. No. 1002] to provide for the submission of proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and to accept the ePlus filing, Lawson respectfully submits that the schedule requiring the submission of response briefs on the issues of colorable differences, infringement

LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.

By: _____ /s/

Josh A. Krevitt (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Daniel J. Thomasch (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Christopher D. Dusseault (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Jason C. Lo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Richard W. Mark (admitted *pro hac vice*)
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-0193
Telephone: (212) 351-4000
Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

Attorneys for Defendant Lawson Software, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 15th day of April, 2013, a true copy of the foregoing will be filed electronically with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notification of such filing (NEF) to the following:

Craig T. Merritt
Paul W. Jacobs, II
Henry I. Willett, III
CHRISTIAN & BARTON, LLP
909 East Main Street, Suite 1200
Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095
cmerritt@cblaw.com
pjacobs@cblaw.com
hwillett@cblaw.com

Michael G. Strapp
Goodwin Procter, LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-2881
mstrapp@goodwinprocter.com

Jennifer A. Albert
David M. Young (VSB No. 35997)
Goodwin Procter, LLP
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
jalbert@goodwinprocter.com
dyoung@goodwinprocter.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

/s/

Dabney J. Carr, IV (VSB No. 28679)
Robert A. Angle (VSB No. 37691)
Megan C. Rahman (VSB No. 42678)
dabney.carr@troutmansanders.com
robert.angle@troutmansanders.com
megan.rahman@troutmansanders.com
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP
1001 Haxall Point
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone: (804) 697-1200
Facsimile: (804) 697-1339
Counsel for Defendant Lawson Software, Inc.

